

## FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

## **VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL**

NOV -8 2011

J. Ashley Cooper, Treasurer Lally for Congress 2017 Boulevard Napoleon Louisville, KY 40205

**RE: MUR 6424** 

Dear Mr. Cooper:

On November 10, 2010, the Federal Election Commission notified Lally for Congress ("Committee") and you, as treasurer, of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended. On October 20, 2011, based upon the information contained in the complaint, and information provided by you, the Commission decided to dismiss the complaint and closed its file in this matter. Accordingly, the Commission closed its file in this matter on October 20, 2011.

Documents related to the case will be placed on the public record within 30 days. See Statement of Policy Regarding Disclosure of Closed Enforcement and Related Files, 68 Fed. Reg. 70,426 (Dec. 18, 2003). A copy of the dispositive General Counsel's Report is enclosed for your information.

If you have any questions, please contact Frankie D. Hampton, the paralegal assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

Sincerely,

Anthony Herman General Counsel

BY: Jeff S. Jordan

Supervisory Attorney
Complaints Examination and
Legal Administration

Enclosure
General Counsel's Report

RECEIVED FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

1	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION		
2	COMMISSION 2011 SEP 26 PM 4: 58		
3 4 5 6 7	In the Matter of  DISMISSAL AND  CELA  MUR 6424  LALLY FOR CONGRESS AND  DISMISSAL AND  CASE CLOSURE UNDER THE  DESCRIPTION OF THE STATEM  DESCRIPTION OF THE STATEM		
8 9 10 11	AND J. ASHLEY COOPER, AS TREASURER )		
12	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT		
13	Under the Enforcement Priority Systum ("EPS"), the Commission uses formal scoring		
14	criteria to allocate its resources and decide which cases to pursue. These criteria include, but are		
15	not limited to, an assessment of (1) the gravity of the alleged violation, both with respect to the		
16	type of activity and the amount in violation, (2) the apparent impact the alleged violation may		
17	have had on the electoral process, (3) the legal complexity of issues raised in the case, (4) recent		
18	trends in potential violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("Act"),		
19	and (5) development of the law with respect to certain subject matters. It is the Commission's		
20	policy that pursuing low-rated matters, compared to other higher-rated matters on the		
21	Enforcement docket, warrants the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss certain cases.		
22	The Office of General Counsel has sourced MUR 6424 as a low-rated matter and has also		
23	determined that it should not be referred to the Alternative Dispute Resolution Office. This		
24	Office therefore recommends that the Commission exercise its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss		
25	MUR 6424.		
26	In this matter, complainant Maxwell Morley alleges that Lally for Congress and J. Ashley		
27	Cooper, in his official capacity as treasurer ("the Committee), violated the Act and Commission		
28	regulations by failing "to properly designate contributions received" from federally-registered		
29	political action committees ("PACs"). Specifically, according to the complainant, the		
30	Committee's 2010 October Quarterly Report improperly disclosed that \$20,500 in contributions		

Case Closure Under EPS - MUR 6424 General Counsel's Report Page 2

- were made by "organizations." Similarly, the complainant asserts that on its 2010 Pre-General
- 2 Report, the Committee improperly disclosed that \$8,000 in contributions were made by
- 3 "organizations."<sup>2</sup>
- 4 In response, the Committee acknowledges that several PAC contributions had
- been designated improperly in its reports. The Committee explains that the errors
- 6 occurred where its "accounting staff did not receive their FEC information that is
- 7 required by [the Committee's] accounting software"... which "caused the PAC
- 8 contributions to be designated improperly in the reports." According to the Committee,
- 9 once the errors were brought to its accountant's attention, he corrected them and amended
- 10 the reports.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

A review of the Committee's 2010 October Quarterly and Pre-General Reports discloses \$20,500 and \$8,000 in PAC contributions, described above, as itemized receipts on the Reports' respective Schedule As, see 11 C.F.R. § 104.3(a)(4). However, on the Detailed Summary Pages at the beginning of the Reports, the Committee's PAC contribution are lumped in with itemized contributions from individuals and others, rather than being reported on separatu lines. In response to three reporting anomalias, on November 24, 2010, the Committee took complete remedial action by filing amended 2010 October Quarterly and Pre-General Reports, which

properly disclosed the \$28,500 in PAC contributions at issue on line 11(c) of the Reports'

19 respective Detailed Summary Pages.

These contributions are as follows: \$1,000 from Iraq Veterans for Congress PAC on September 30, 2010; \$2,500 from Pharmerica PAC on September 30, 2010; \$5,000 from Kentucky Bankers PAC on September 28, 2010; \$5,000 from American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians PAC on September 28, 2010; \$2,000 from National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association ("Rock PAC") on September 30, 2010; and \$5,000 from Association of Builders and Contractors PAC on September 30, 2010.

These contributions are \$3,000 from Automotive Free International Trade PAC on October 4, 2010 and \$5,000 from BuildPAC on October 7, 2010.

Case Closure Under EPS – MUR 6424 General Counsel's Report Page 3

1	In light of the technical nature of the alleged violations and the fact that complete		
2	corrective action has already been taken by the Committee, further Enforcement action is not		
3	warranted. Accordingly, under EPS, the Office of General Counsel has scored MUR 6424 as		
4	low-rated matter and therefore, in furtherance of the Commission's priorities, as discussed		
5	above, the Office of General Counsel believes that the Commission should exercise its		
6	prosecutorial discretion and dismiss this matter. See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985).		
7	RECOMMENDATIONS		
8	The Office of General Counsel recommends that the Commission dismiss MUR 6424,		
9	close the file, and approve the appropriate letters.		
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	9/34/1/ Date BY:	Anthony Herman General Counsel  Gregory R. Baker Special Counsel Complaints Examination & Legal Administration  Jeff S. Jordan Supervisory Attorney Complaints Examination & Legal Administration	
32 33 34		Attorney	
35	1		
36			
37	1		